

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached new sheet of drawing includes new Fig. 4.

Attachment: New Sheet

REMARKS

In response to the objection to the drawings, a new drawing sheet containing a Fig. 4 that is like Fig. 1 but illustrates a longitudinally extending row of dots, short sections, a weakening section including at least one groove formed by depression, and a longitudinally extending cord member is submitted herewith. In addition, brief and more-detailed descriptions of Fig. 4 have been added to the specification, but the subject matter of these descriptions is already contained in the original disclosure.

In response to the claim objections, in line 2 of claim 7, “the” has been changed to “an”, and in line 2 of claim 9, “the” has been deleted.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over the Sonneborn et al. reference in view of the Williams reference is respectfully requested. In making this rejection, the Examiner refers several times to a marked figure. However, no marked figure could be found in or with the Office Action.

The Examiner acknowledges that Sonneborn et al. fails to disclose that at least one of said corner segments at a surface thereof comprises at least one indication indicating a pattern, such that at least a part of the sheet section may be separated from the remaining part of the flashing member along the indications in order to transform the respective corner segment from an initial state to a transformed state, a feature that is recited in claim 1. In fact, Sonneborn et al. is not concerned with the transformation of the individual flashing members from an initial state to a transformed state.

The Examiner contends that Williams discloses a corner segment comprising at least one indication (30) indicating a pattern, such that at least a part of the sheet section may be separated

from the remaining part of the flashing member along the indications in order to transform the respective corner segment from an initial state to a transformed state. In making the rejection, the Examiner indicates parenthetically that she considers moving part of the sheet section of Williams out of the plane of another section (25H) to constitute separating a part of the sheet section from the remaining part of the sheet section. However, no separation between any of the parts of the sheet section takes place. The parts are not separated from one another in any way, even partially. The parts remain as fully connected to one another after folding as they do before folding. The American Heritage[®] Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition defines the verb “separate” as “To set or keep apart; disunite”. Similarly, the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary defines the verb “separate” in pertinent part as “to set or keep apart: DISCONNECT, SEVER”. No part of the sheet section of Williams is set apart, disunited, disconnected or severed from any other part. Thus, neither reference describes or hints at separating any part of a sheet from any other part, and neither reference discloses this feature of claim 1.

Furthermore, neither reference suggests any reason for separating any part of a sheet from any other part. Separating a part of a sheet from another part, for the purpose of adaptation to different installation situations, is neither described nor hinted at. In the current application, it is clearly stated that the purpose of separating material is to allow a standard flashing member to be adapted for several different uses (see e.g. page 3, lines 25-29). On the contrary, Williams is concerned solely with the making of folded standard components, which are not multifunctional, but are intended for use either at the right-hand side or at the left-hand side of the window (see e.g. column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 3). Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art, and that the dependent claims are allowable with claim 1.

Furthermore, at least some of the dependent claims further distinguish the present invention over the prior art. For example, claim 3 recites that each indication (22, 32, 34, 38) comprises a weakening section. Williams does not disclose or suggest a weakening section, but only marking where folds will be made (column 3, lines 18-20). In the Office Action, reference is made to column 3, lines 62-65 of Williams, which says that "A diagonal fold along crease line 30 is followed by stapling...", but there is nothing to suggest, that this line should be pre-made. On the contrary, as is described in the specification of Williams (see e.g. column 3, lines 26-27), the crease line is made by an initial bending intended for guiding the subsequent folding of the flashing member and this may thus be seen as a sub-process of the folding process.

Claim 6 recites the weakening sections comprising a longitudinally extending cord member accommodated in the corner segment. This is described in the specification at page 8, line 32 – page 9, line 4, where it is also indicated that this corresponds to the principle used in connection with, for example, cans for food, biscuit packages, etc. According to the Office Action, this is known from Fig. 1, reference numbers 28, 29 and 30, of Williams, but the applicants have been unable to find any basis for this assertion. The reference numbers cited are used only for dashed lines and crease lines.

Claim 7 recites that the pattern defines one or more indications delimiting an area (26, 37) of an end portion (20, 30) which, when separation has taken place, can be removed. Williams says nothing about the removal of material. Furthermore, although the Examiner states that the area between lines 29 and 30 can be removed, Williams discloses no separation and further discloses that the area between lines 29 and 30 stays. The suggestion by the Examiner that a piece of material delimited by the lines 29 and 30 could in principle be removed is not suggested


by the references and is clearly a case of hindsight.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0562.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5-27-08


John P. Shannon
Registration No. 29,276

Merek, Blackmon & Voorhees, LLC
673 South Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 684-5633
Customer No. 48234

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 5-27-08


John P. Shannon